



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/584,669	05/21/2007	Graham Alexander Robertson	920602-103442	5056
23644 7590 02/11/2008 BARNES & THORNBURG LLP P.O. BOX 2786 CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786			EXAMINER MATTHEWS, TERRELL HOWARD	
			ART UNIT 3653	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 02/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent-ch@btlaw.com

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/584,669

Applicant(s)

ROBERTSON, GRAHAM  
ALEXANDER

Examiner

Terrell H. Matthews

Art Unit

3653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 13-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.                          |

Art Unit: 3653

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 16 is a duplicate of Claim 15. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 16 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. Claim 16 fails to further limit the subject matter of previous claim 15.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 13-18, 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Cook (US-6675975).

Referring to claims 13-18, 20-22. Cook discloses a "Filtering Screen and Support Frame". See Figs. 1-24 and respective portions of the specification. Cook further

Art Unit: 3653

discloses a frame (10) over which woven wire mesh is to be stretched and secured to form a sieving screen which can be used to screen solids from drilling mud recovered from down-hole when drilling for oil or gas comprising a rectilinear moulded plastics frame (10) having edge regions by which it is secured in place in a shaker and defining a plurality of rectilinear windows (See at least Fig. 11) formed by an orthogonal array of intersecting ribs (See at least col. 1 l. 45-55) also of moulded plastics material wherein some of the ribs are internally reinforced by rigid metal members (See at least Col. 1 l. 55-61) which extend orthogonally between hollow box-section members which defined a rectilinear sub-frame, the orthogonal members being secured at their ends to the hollow box section members and the ends of the latter are joined at four corners of the sub-frame, so that not only are the edge regions forming the perimeter of the screen frame reinforced, but so also are some of the orthogonally intersecting ribs, so thereby to produce a rigid screen frame. Cook further discloses wherein the frame is formed from a plastics material which may be reinforced with glass fibres or similar reinforcing material and the edge regions and the crossing members of the frame are all reinforced with elongate steel wires (See at least Col. 10 l. 63-67). Cook further discloses wherein the box-section members of the perimeter reinforcing members having a rectangular cross-section (See at least Figs. 1-2,11). Additionally, Cook discloses wherein the frame is clamped into a vibratory screening machine (See at least Col. 2 l. 1-2).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook.

Referring to claim 19. Cook discloses the invention as described above in detail.

Cook does not disclose wherein the box-section members of the perimeter reinforcing frame have a square cross-section. However, Cook discloses the claimed invention except for wherein the box-section members of the perimeter reinforcing frame have a square cross-section. It would have been one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to make the reinforcing frame have a square-cross section however, as it is generally known in the field of the art. Furthermore, the applicant has not disclosed that having reinforcing members with a square cross-section solves any stated problem or is for any particular purpose and it appears that the invention would perform equally well with rectangular cross-section reinforcing members.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Burnett (US-2006/0180509).

Referring to claim 23. Cook discloses the apparatus as described in detail above.

Cook does not disclose wherein the screen is clamped into position in shaker basket using a pneumatic seal. Burnett discloses a "Screen Assembly For A Shale Shaker". See Figs. 1-5b and respective portions of the specification. Burnett further discloses

Art Unit: 3653

pneumatic seals (333) which clamp a screen into position within a shaker basket. It should be noted that it is generally known in the field of the art to use pneumatic seals to hold a screen in position within a shaker basket. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Cook to include the teachings of Burnett wherein pneumatic seals were included as a means of clamping the screen in position within the shaker basket so that the screen could be clamped within the shaker in a tight and secure engagement, in an efficient manner which would assist in more effective screening during operation.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cook in view of Riddle (US-2005/0247604).

Referring to claim 26. Cook discloses the apparatus as described above. Cook does not disclose wherein the screen is clamped in position by wedges driven into position between abutments protruding internally from the shaker basket and the upper face of the regions of the screen. Riddle discloses a "Screen and Screen Frame For Improved Screen to Shaker Placement". See Figs. 1-3 and respective portions of the specification. Riddle further discloses wherein wedges (24) and wedge block clamps (26) are used to clamp the screen in position within a shaker basket. It should be noted that it is generally known in the field of the art to use wedges to hold a screen in position with a shaker basket. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the apparatus of Cook to include the teachings of

Art Unit: 3653

Riddle wherein wedges were used to secure and hold the screen to the shaker so that screen could be clamped to the shaker in an simple, reliable, and efficient manner.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 24-25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Terrell H. Matthews whose telephone number is (571)272-5929. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Mackey can be reached on (571) 272-6916. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 3653

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

THM



PATRICK MACKEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600